

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 13, 15 through 27 and 29 through 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the withdrawal of the currently pending rejections.

The Section 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 26, 29 through 39 and 42 through 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Ueta et al. reference in view of the Kawamura et al. reference.

The Examiner has pointed out that every element of the above independent claims has been disclosed by a combination of the two cited references. Although the Examiner concedes that the Ueta et al. reference discloses every element except for the outline characteristic including information or vertical, horizontal, right and left edges, the Examiner has indicated that the Ueta et al. reference allegedly suggests a spatial arrangement including a direction between two elements. For the lack of the above conceded lack of the clear disclosure, the Examiner has additionally cited the Kawamura et al. reference. The Examiner has indicated with respect to FIGURE 1 that the Kawamura et al. reference discloses the spatial arrangements of the edges. Thus, the Examiner has concluded that the combined disclosures makes the subject matter of the independent claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Newly amended independent claim 1 now each explicitly recites “inputting a user input value” and “selecting a correction coefficient from a set of predetermined correction coefficients based upon a combination of said outline characteristic and said user input value.” Similarly, newly amended independent claim 29 now each explicitly recites “inputting user input values”

and “selecting a correction coefficient from a set of predetermined correction coefficients based upon a combination of the outline characteristic and the user input values.” Newly amended independent claim 15 also explicitly recites “an operation unit for inputting a user input value” and “an intensity correction unit … for selecting a correction coefficient from a set of predetermined correction coefficients based upon a combination of the outline characteristic and the user input value.” In other words, the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 1, 15 and 29 selects the “a correction coefficient” according to “a combination of” both the “outline characteristics” and the “user input value(s).” These patentable features have been incorporated into newly amended independent claims 1 and 15 respectively from now cancelled dependent claims 6 and 20. Newly amended independent claim 29 has substantially recited these patentable features in the original form.

The Examiner has pointed out on page 7 in the Office Action that the Ueta et al. reference discloses the use of the user input value for selecting a correction coefficient. According to the Examiner, the interface unit 57 in FIGURE 1 of the Ueta et al. reference corresponds to the operation unit of the current invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has also indicated an additional disclosure at lines 65 through 67 in column 3 of the Ueta et al. reference for the use of the “user input value” in relation to the coefficient selection. The above portions of the Ueta et al. reference is irrelevant to the patentable feature of the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims.

In contrast to the above discussed patentable feature of the current invention, the cited portion of the Ueta et al. reference discloses the user determined value of the correction coefficients. In other words, prior to selecting a certain correction coefficient value, the system of the Ueta et al. reference allows to input a user-selected correction coefficient values. Newly amended independent claims each require that the inputted user input value is used “in combination” with the “outline characteristic” to select “a correction coefficient from a set of predetermined correction coefficients.”

For this reason, even if the cited references are combined, the combined disclosures still fail to disclose, teach or suggest the patentable features of the current invention as explicitly recited in newly amended independent claims 1, 15 and 29. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary in the art to provide the above discussed patentable feature of the current invention as explicitly recited in the newly amended independent claims based upon the cited prior art.

Dependent claims are also patentably distinct. Dependent claims 6 and 20 have been cancelled. Other dependent claims 2 through 5, 7 through 13, 16 through 19, 21 through 27, 30 through 40 and 42 through 44 ultimately depend from one of newly amended independent claims 1, 15 and 29 and incorporate the patentable features of the newly amended independent claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submit to the Examiner that the rejection of claims 1 through 26, 29 through 39 and 42 through 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

/KIY/

Date: March 9, 2007

Ken I. Yoshida, Esq.
Reg. No. 37,009

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY LLC
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350
Customer No. 21,302
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 599-0600